EXHIBIT "S-3"

Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

24

25

THE CLERK: Hector Rivas.

(The defendant was present for the following.)

THE COURT: You can be seated, sir. You can be seated.

Okay. This is the matter of the People of the State of New York v. Hector Rivas.

Ed Klein as well as Sidney Manes appear along with Hector Rivas. ADA Rob Moran appears on behalf of the People.

Thank you all for appearing today on short notice.

Let's do some housekeeping. Let me see if I can put this into some perspective.

I recently received the December 23rd, 2015 order of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals with regard to this matter and I've added this case to the calendar this morning in order to address the Second Circuit's concerns.

The Second Circuit's order stated that unless a retrial has commenced on or before February 1st, 2016, the State of New York would have to show cause why the defendant should not be released from custody pending a retrial.

The Second Circuit has further indicated its

Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

expectation that Mr. Richard Langone would be ready to proceed as trial counsel by that date.

I would like to briefly note the unusual procedural history of this case.

On March 11th, 2015, the Second Circuit issued a decision directing the Federal District Court to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to the defendant within 60 days unless the State had taken concrete and substantial steps expeditiously to retry the defendant.

On March 25th, 2015, Mr. Rivas initially appeared before this Court with his appellate attorney, Richard Langone, as well as Mr. Manes, who has been assisting the defendant pro bono.

Senior ADA Rob Moran also appeared on behalf of the People.

I did not set a trial date at that time only because Mr. Langone had indicated that he was unsure if he would be representing the defendant at trial.

Nevertheless, Mr. Langone indicated that he would be filing a motion to vacate the defendant's judgment of conviction pursuant to Criminal Procedure Law 440.10.

I set a motion return date of April 20th, 2015 and Mr. Langone subsequently filed a motion to vacate the judgment of conviction.

On April 20th, 2015, I granted the

Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

defendant's motion to vacate his judgment of conviction based upon a determination that the defendant had been deprived of the effective assistance of counsel at his original trial in 1993.

The People also re-announced their readiness for trial on the indictment because Mr. Langone indicated that he would like to remain involved in this case through motion practice, but was still unsure if he would be involved in a retrial.

I assigned Attorney Edward Klein to represent the defendant at taxpayer expense.

After a bail hearing, I also made a determination regarding that issue. Based upon the consent of all parties, I set a motion schedule and set a date for retrial upon the consent of all of the attorneys on December 7th, 2015.

Mr. Langone subsequently advised the Court that he would not be participating in the retrial.

Moreover, Mr. Klein asked for additional time in which to file motions and requested an adjournment of the trial in order to retain the services of an expert witness who would testify regarding the time of death of the decedent.

It's my recollection that Mr. Klein indicated that the expert witness in question would not be

Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

available for trial in December. Accordingly, I granted Mr. Klein's request to reschedule the trial for a new agreed upon date of March 21st, 2016.

As I previously have noted, the Second Circuit subsequently issued its December 23rd, 2015 order.

With all due respect to the Second Circuit, I was somewhat confused at the language of the order suggesting that Mr. Langone would be able to try this case by February 1st, 2016 in light of his previous statement in this Court that he would not be involved in the retrial of this case.

My chambers subsequently reached out to Mr. Langone and advised him of today's Court appearance. Mr. Langone was unable to appear today, which is most certainly understandable given the fact that his law office is several hundred miles away. Nevertheless, Mr. Langone submitted a letter to the Second Circuit and provided a copy to my chambers.

In pertinent part, that letter reads as follows:

"Dear Your Honors. I received the Court's order to show cause directing me to be ready to represent Mr. Rivas at a retrial in the event the State is ready to proceed by February 1st, 2016."

And Mr. Langone then indicates (ECFDKT 204).

"I have spoken to Edward Klein, Esquire, who was appointed by the State to represent Mr. Rivas.

Mr. Klein does not know if the State is actually ready to retry Mr. Rivas, but Mr. Klein is not ready as he has not -- as he still has not filed motions and has another trial scheduled to begin the end of January, 2016.

"Mr. Klein told me that Mr. Rivas' case is on the trial calendar for the end of March, 2016. In my professional opinion, the Rivas case requires substantial motion practice given the 30 years that have elapsed since the crime was committed and the current impediments to him receiving a fair trial at this late date.

"While I am willing to represent Mr. Rivas at the retrial, the earliest I can try his case would be at the end of March, 2016, as my case load is simply too congested to try it earlier.

"I have a reply brief due in this Court on

January 7th at a massive civil rights case, in re

Restivo, R-E-S-T-I-V-O, versus County of Nassau, Docket

46462. I have a murder case in Richmond County Supreme

Court that is tentatively scheduled for trial

February 21st, 2015, People v. Thomas Spagnulo,

S-P-A-G-N-U-L-O, 2015-R1003100. I have appeals in two criminal cases that are overdue, People v. L., Appellate Division Second Department, filed 2014-07882, and People v. Robert Cassandro, C-A-S-S-A-N-D-R-O, First Department, New York County, Indictment Number 10362-12.

"The last thing I ever want to do is disappoint the Court. I can promise to have all pretrial motions filed and the case prepped for trial by April 1st, 2016, but to force me to try it sooner would not be in the best interests of justice."

And it is signed, "Respectfully yours, Richard M. Langone."

I'm unclear as to whether the Second Circuit is aware of my effort to get this case retried.

Frankly, I find it hard to believe that they do. I am willing to readjust my trial calendar and schedule this matter for trial on February 1st, 2016, but, it is clear that Mr. Langone would not be able to try this case on that day.

I've spoken with our Commissioner of Jurors and I can try this case and jurors would be available as of February 1.

Would the People be ready to try this case on February 1?

MR. MORAN: Absolutely.

position be with regard to a February 1st trial date?

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, we appeared in this

Court on November 18th and had lengthy discussions

about where I was at in the case, and, excuse me, where

I was at in the case in terms of preparation and what I

would need to be doing, and I had concerns about the

March trial date and was requesting the Court consider

adjourning it until later, possibly May or June.

THE COURT: Mr. Klein, what would your

For various reasons, we left it on that date. We adjusted the motion date, which I think is January 21st, that it's on the calendar right now. Nothing has changed for me since that November 18th date.

There are items I asked this morning, I think I put on the record the issue having to do with marijuana pipes, and on the November 18th appearance, there were marijuana pipes or piping found in the vicinity of the body 28 years ago that were never tested. They were never -- it was never looked at by Mr. Cali. It was never thought of by Mr. Cali.

I didn't know about that until September when I received the same video and I believe 17 photographs and then I understood the importance of the marijuana Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

pipe.

2.0

Also, looking through the police reports, I had clear that there is evidence that Mr. Rivas did not smoke marijuana. So, it becomes a significant piece of evidence that needs to be explored.

I asked Mr. Moran, the pipe had been at the lab, was not tested. I asked for it to be tested for DNA.

Speaking with him this morning, my understanding is, he did request the lab do that and they are going to issue a report sometime next week, apparently.

So, things have been going on that need to be done to be properly prepared for trial. Those things have been going on and will continue to go on until we are ready for trial, but it wouldn't be in Mr. Rivas' best interests from the defense standpoint in January and there is no way that it can be fairly tried in January even if the People are theoretically ready and able to call and proceed with their testimony.

So, nothing has changed since November. I can try for the March date, but I again caution the Court that I don't know that we are going to be ready.

THE COURT: So, the first trial date, you would not be ready to proceed is, at that point, at -- Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

MR. KLEIN: No, nor would Mr. Langone, even if he were free.

There are things that need to be done that cannot be done in that time frame. And I understand, to a certain extent, the Second Circuit's frustration. They may be able to view, if it was going to take this long, Mr. Rivas, under the circumstances, that they found or they found potential for actual innocence based on the record they had before them, that he should not still be in custody, but, if it's going to be retried, and I'm retrying it, it can't be done in January, consistent with Mr. Rivas' best interests, and it would be an effort to get it ready by March 21st.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KLEIN: And just the reference to the marijuana pipe is just one example. There are many others that I could give the Court, but that, in and of itself, is enough, waiting for that report, not knowing what the report is going to say and the possibility of the need to go retain our own DNA expert, and we are talking -- we are already in the middle of January by that point. So, it would be an impossible task to try this case by then.

THE COURT: Mr. Moran, did you want to be heard any further, sir?

Proceedings

MR. MORAN: One of the reasons, Judge, that it's taken so long to get those DNA reports finished is that we had to get Mr. Rivas' DNA in order to compare them to whatever may be generated from the items of evidence he wants tested.

That wasn't accomplished until we asked the Court for an order, and the Court granted that in November. I had asked earlier if Mr. Rivas would be willing to voluntarily give over a sample, and up until that point, he was saying, "No, we are not going to voluntarily give over a sample."

One of the reasons for any delay in those DNA reports is Mr. Rivas' unwillingness to voluntarily give over a sample, which meant we had to wait until we had something to compare it to, which takes some time.

THE COURT: Mr. Rivas, it's a difficult and a frustrating position for me to be in.

First of all, Mr. Klein is an experienced and an excellent trial attorney. I did not assign him to this case, which is a critically important case, case of this magnitude, without careful consideration. But, under the circumstances, I cannot conclude that it would be prudent to require Mr. Klein to try this case on February 1st. It doesn't sound like that's in anyone's best interests.

Proceedings

Indeed, if I were to do that, I would be virtually insuring that if there were a conviction and a retrial, that this case would come back following an Appellate review.

The People have been ready for trial. They indicated again today that they are available for trial on that February 1st basis. I have no basis to conclude that this announcement is an illusionary one by the People.

In light of the fact that neither Mr. Langone nor Mr. Klein would be ready to try this case by February 1st, despite the fact that I've contacted our Commissioner of Jurors and I could have a jury panel ready for you, I cannot in good conscience force either of the attorneys to try this case by that date.

I previously gave Mr. Klein a trial date of March 21st. I'll keep this matter scheduled for trial on that date.

We talked about the filing of motions,

Mr. Klein. You indicated, in your review, there were

some unique issues for motion practice. Why don't you

tell me when you can get your motions in and I'll give

you -- I will give you a date regarding filing an

argument.

MR, KLEIN: I'd like to leave the 21st date on Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

Proceedings

for me to have a date that I'm aiming at, Judge, 21st of January for filing, and I'd really like to keep that on. It will be an effort.

And as things continue to evolve, as I learn more about the case, and I won't burden you with details, but, it's a complex case because of how badly Mr. Rivas was represented in 1993 from his arrest in November of '92, to a trial in March of '93, and the passage of time. It's a complex situation and can't be done quickly.

I'm going to try to have them in by the 21st.

THE COURT: I just honestly don't recall. Did

MR. KLEIN: I think it was the 21st.

I give you a motion argument date?

THE COURT: Is the argument date, Ed?

MR. KLEIN: Yes. So, we can leave that on as a court date for either me to file motions or appear; that sort of thing. I'd like to keep a target so that I keep focused on it.

THE COURT: So, January 21st, 2016, is for the argument of motions.

Anything further, Mr. Klein, Mr. Manes, anything?

MR. KLEIN: Couple of things.

One, I note for the record that Mr. Langone
Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

Proceedings

has not entered an appearance here. He's not counsel of record for Mr. Rivas.

THE COURT: He told me on the record here previously that he would not be. That's one of the reasons I was confused by the Second Circuit's letter decision.

MR. KLEIN: And I'm not sure, first of all, it's Mr. Rivas' choice to a certain extent and that decision has been made and I'm not sure that Mr. Rivas would accept Mr. Langone being forced on him, as Mr. Langone uses that term, by the Second Circuit.

So, it is my case and the decision about whether we are ready or not is my decision based on my knowledge of the case, not Mr. Langone.

THE COURT: I understand.

Sidney?

MR. MANES: Judge, may I be heard for just one second?

THE COURT: Please.

MR. MANES: I've been involved in this case, as the Court knows, for 19 years.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANES: I just want to emphasize to the

Court that this is a 30 year old case, Number 1.

Mr. Rivas has served 24 years in a minimum sentence of

Adam H. Alweis, RPR - Senior Court Reporter

25 to life.

I just wonder if this Court can have the benefit of reducing bail to a dollar so Mr. Rivas, as the Court has indicated, while this is all pending, let Mr. Rivas go home.

He's not going to go anywhere, Judge. He has family in the Bronx. He has lived here all his life. He has not run. He didn't run when he was indicted. He didn't run.

So, I'm asking the Court, under the circumstances, with all that's going on between the District Attorney and Mr. Klein and all that's being discovered, let Mr. Rivas go home.

The Court has indicated very clearly in the Second Circuit that had Mr. Cali been the minimum efficient, the jury would not have convicted him and then they said, on top of that, "actual innocence."

Judge -- Judge Miller, I've known Mr. Rivas all these years. I've known his family, his children, his wife. He ought to go home to the Bronx and not continue to sit here in jail under the circumstances of what the Second Circuit found, without question, and I would ask the Court to please consider that.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Manes. I appreciate that.

1 Mr. Moran, would you like to be heard? 2 MR. MORAN: Judge, I've said all I've said about bail. I think this might be the fifth or sixth 3 4 different bail application that Mr. Rivas or various 5 attorneys have made. I don't have anything to add to 6 what I've already said before. I think bail is 7 appropriate to what it is. 8 THE COURT: Despite Mr. Manes' excellent 9 arguments on your behalf, Mr. Rivas, I am not going to 10 change the bail. What the Second Circuit may do is up to the 11 12 Second Circuit, but I am not going to change your bail 13 here in this Court. I'll see you back here for the argument of 14 15 motions, hopefully, on that January -- January 20 --MR. KLEIN: May we approach? 16 THE COURT: -- January 21 date. 17 MR. MORAN: Judge, in anticipation of that, I 18 will provide the Court with the Grand Jury minutes, if 19 I haven't already done that, so you can review those. 20 I believe that's part of the motions, anyway. It will 21 expedite matters. 22 THE COURT: Thanks. 23 MR. KLEIN: May we approach? 24 THE COURT: Sure. 25

(Bench conference.)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Klein, did you want to be heard any further?

MR. KLEIN: Well, in thinking about it further, Judge, with the DNA report coming in sometime next week and the Second Circuit response to this not being scheduled for trial, happily, around the 1st, I think it makes sense to adjourn the motion argument date.

So, I would request that be adjourned to February 5th, so we don't lose too much time, but still have those things accomplished.

I also say, as part of that request, and we discussed this up at the bench, and I thought I made this clear, but I am the attorney of record for Mr. Rivas now and Mr. Langone is not. He has not entered an appearance.

As the Court has indicated, he was asked about that and indicated that he would not be representing Mr. Rivas. I think that was during sometime during the summer and that has stayed unchanged until the order of the Second Circuit,

December 23rd, which suggested that somehow Mr. Langone would be able -- would be representing -- would be able to represent Mr. Rivas in the trial of this matter.

	Proceedings
1	As we stand here today, I am Mr. Rivas'
2	attorney. He wants me to be his trial attorney and not
3	Mr. Langone.
4	THE COURT: You've heard what your attorney
5	has said, Mr. Rivas. Is that true, sir?
6	THE DEFENDANT: Very clear, Judge Miller.
7	THE COURT: And that is true?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Very good.
10	Okay. I'll see you back here on February 5th
11	for the argument of motions.
12	MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Thank you all.
14	* * *
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

I, Adam H. Alweis, RPR, Senior Court
Reporter, Fifth Judicial District, State of New
York, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true
and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes
from the proceedings had therein.

July 1

Senior Court Reporter

Adam H. Alweis, RPR